



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,881	09/27/2005	Hugo Johan Cornelissen	NL 030300	1545
24737 7590 10/30/2007 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			EXAMINER HEYMAN, JOHN S	
			ART UNIT 2871	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/30/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/550,881		CORNELISSEN, HUGO JOHAN	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	John Heyman		2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the first and the second image" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. Claim 12, as amended is, and Claim 13 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Ida of record. Looking at Claim 12, Ida discloses a display panel (col. 1, line 11), light redirection element 20 for directing light through the display panel; light guide 12 for directing light towards the light redirection element; first and second light sources 14 and 14' respectively coupled to the light guide; wherein light redirection element 20 has a first groove structure (Fig. 3) and the light guide has a second groove structure 12-3 (Fig. 2C), and the groove structures are configured to inherently have first and second angular distributions from each of the light sources to display 2D images to thus anticipate this claim.
3. Regarding Claim 13, by eliminating intervening claims in rewriting Claim 12, this claim is anticipated by Ida since only a 2D image is displayed. That is, whether, the light sources are simultaneously or synchronously illuminated, only a 2D display is provided, which is anticipated by Ida.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1-11 and 14- 18 of record, and new Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baba, of record in view of Ida, of record. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered, but are not deemed persuasive. Baba shows the basic features of these claims as amended. That is, looking at Claim 1, Baba shows and discloses, a display panel 5, light redirection element 6, light guide 101-102, first light source 2a and second light source 2b, all coupled as recited in clauses 1-5 in this claim. Light redirection element 6 is shown (Figs. 5 and 6) to have a groove structure operable to direct light from the first light source through the display panel with a first angular distribution and the light from the second light source with a second angular distribution which is different from the first angular distribution as recited in this last clause. Not shown, however, is a second groove structure for the light guide. Ida shows a light guide in Fig. 2C having a groove structure 12-3. It would have been obvious to employ the light guide of Ida with its groove structure as the light guide in Baba for the reason given in Ida, namely, to enhance the brightness as a surface illuminant device (col. 6, line 65).
2. Regarding Claim 2, Baba discloses means 7 for alternately and synchronously driving light sources 2a and 2b to display first and second images as recited in this claim. See para 23 in Baba.
3. Regarding Claims 3 and 4, note that the groove structures on each of redirection element 6 and light guide 101-102, as modified by Fig. 2C in Ida, are arranged in

opposed configuration as recited in Claim 3, while first groove structure 6 in Baba is a prism with a triangular cross-section as recited in Claim 4.

4. Regarding Claim 5, note Fig. 6 of Baba in which the angle of joining sides forming the triangular cross-section of the prism structure of the first groove structure 6 is 69 degrees ($a_1 + a_2$ from para. 28) which is within the range recited in this claim.

5. Regarding Claims 6 and 7, Fig. 2C in Ida shows a substantially triangular cross-section (Fig. 2C) for the grooves of the second groove structure 12-3, while col. 6, line 63 of Ida discloses an angle of 150 degrees to meet claim 7.

6. Regarding Claim 8, note Fig. 5 of Baba to show that first and second groove structures in 6 (Baba) and 12-3 (Ida) extend in a direction substantially perpendicular to an axis extending between the eyes... as recited in this claim.

7. Regarding Claims 9 and 10, see the last 9 lines of the abstract of Baba to meet the limitation of these claims.

8. Regarding Claim 11, as noted in the first Office Action and not argued by the amendment, Baba inherently or obviously provides first and second images for first and second users since they would correspond to the first and second images of the left and right eyes as disclosed by Baba. Again, see the abstract of Baba.

9. Regarding Claim 14, see col. 12, line 48 of Ida which discloses a cold cathode tube used as a light source to meet this claim.

10. Regarding Claim 15, note para. 18 in Baba which discloses a liquid crystal display panel 5 to meet this claim.

11. Regarding Claim 16, as stated in the first Office Action and not argued in the amendment, it is deemed that the first and second groove structures of Baba inherently extend in a direction perpendicular to the rows of an LCD panel as recited in this claim.

12. Regarding method Claims 17 and 18, the acts recited are met by the acts of operation described by Baba for his device in the Abstract, for example. Ida, like in the rejection of Claim 1 above, shows the second groove structure recited in this claim so that the first and second groove structures recited are met by the combination of Baba and Ida. See the rejection of Claim 1 above.

13. Regarding new Claim 19, dependent upon Claim 1; and new Claim 20, dependent upon Claim 17, Baba shows in Fig. 4 and Ida in Fig. 2C substantially triangular cross-sections for the first and second grooves 6 and 12-3, with the apex for each to be respectively 69 and 150 degrees. See para. 28 in Baba and col. 6, line 63 in Ida.

14. No claim is allowed.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2871

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Heyman whose telephone number is 571 272-5730. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on 571- 272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2871

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JSH


ANDREW SCHECHTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER